REMARKS

The present remark is in response to the Office Action mailed November 3 2004, in which claims 1 through 16 were rejected. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, are believed to render all claims at issue patentable over the cited references.

Claims 1-16 are presently pending in the application. In brief, the main substantive changes to the claims include the added recitation —changing plurality of table structures responsive to an indication— to independent Claims 1, 9, 13; the added recitation -- refreshing a display of said table responsive to said changing step—to independent Claims 1,9,13; the added recitation -- displaying a plurality of display elements in a zone separated from said table—to dependent Claims 2,10,14; the added recitation -- putting at least one said display element into one of said cells in said table by an object-based editing scheme—to dependent Claims 2,10,14; the added recitation -- refreshing said display of said table responsive to said putting step—to dependent Claims 2,10,14; and the added recitation -- with respect to said table in accordance with said put display element—to dependent Claims 2,10,14. However, such amendments are supported by the originally filed specification and its drawings. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1, 9, and 13, for the relative term "substantially". The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the term "substantially" as being relative, since although broad, this term in definite (see MPEP

2173.05(b), and *In re Nehrenberg*, 280 F.2d 161, 126 USPQ 383 (CCPA 1960) and *In re Mattison*, 509 F.2d 563, 184 USPQ 484 (CCPA 1975). However, the amendments to the claims have removed this term and this objection is now moot.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5, 8-10,12-14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C §102(e) as being anticipated by Burch et al. (USP 6,088,708).

Compared to Burch'708, Claims 1, 9, and 13 disclose a method and system of table editing for a web page that a user would directly change or edit table structures corresponding to a layout of the table (amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 13, and page 7, lines 17-26 about FIG.3B; from page 9, line 15 to page 10, line 26 about FIG.6A to FIG.9B). Instead of re-editing HTML codes of the table on the web page, the present invention provides a refreshed table with the generation of the corresponding HTML codes (amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 13, and page 11, lines 1-4).

Oppositely, Burch'708 teaches a HTML table with multitudes of cells that contain contents in the nature of HTML elements. Burch'708 teaches a HTML table which preserves the WYSIWYG appearance of the objects arranged in the layout of a page (col.8, lines 33-50, col.9-10, and col.14). The HTML table is created subject to a layout of objects, which is different form the table editing disclosed by the present Invention. Furthermore, the generated HTML table is used to just display the page of objects on the World Wide Web of the Internet (col.6, lines 35-40) under Windows-based applications. The HTML table taught by Burch'708 is not contained in a web page, which is totally different from the table on a web page disclosed by the present invention.

Furthermore, Burch'708 teaches the layout of a table defined by the framework of cells with new merged cells corresponding to the overlap groups (col.12, lines 53-58).

11

Oppositely, the layout of the table disclosed by the present invention is modified by changing

the table structures (amended independent Claims 1, 9, and 13), instead of subjection of the

display elements in the cells. Thus, the modify mechanism on the table taught by Burch'708

is totally different from the table taught by the present invention. Furthermore, Burch'708

teaches the publishing program module creates a nested HTML layout table and is able to

embed the definition of a nested HTML layout table within the HTML stream (col.27, lines

15-18). However, the nested HTML layout table taught by Burch'708 is different from the

editing method to generate codes with respect to the table (amended independent Claims 1, 9,

and 13) in a Web page disclosed by the present Invention.

In reference to amended Claims 2, 10 and 14, the claims emphasize that these display

elements are added into the cells of the table by an object-based editing scheme (amended

Claims 2, 10 and 14, and page 8, lines 1-21 about FIG.4A and FIG.4B). Oppositely,

Burch'708 teaches the layout of existed objects each having hyperlinks associated with them

(col.11, lines 15-25), which is a sequential editing scheme. Thus, the object-based editing

scheme in the present Invention is totally different from the sequential editing scheme

disclosed by Burch'708.

In reference to Claims 4 and 5, they are dependent on the amended Claim 1. When in

combination with Claim 1, amended Claims 4 and 5 emphasize editing table structures with

respect to the layout of the table. Oppositely, Burch'708 provides adornments associated

with the objects, instead of the layout of the table. Accordingly, the adornments taught by

Burch'708 is totally different from the editing table disclosed by the present Invention.

Claims 8, 12 and 16 are dependent on the amended Claims 2, 10 and 14. Since the

Applicant believes amended Claims 2, 10 and 14 overcome the present rejection, dependent

Claims 8, 12 and 16 should also overcome the present rejection.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) be

reconsidered and withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6,11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Burch et al. (USP 6,088,708) in view of Rawat et al, USP 6,662,340 B2,

and Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch et al. (USP 6,088,708)

in view of Yee et al., USP 6,380,956 B1.

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 13. Claims 6, 11 and 15 are

dependent on Claims 1, 9 and 13, respectively. When in combination with the amended

independent claims, Claims 6, 11 and 15 emphasize the XML codes would be generated

automatically in the present invention. Oppositely, Rawat'340 teaches a client-side form

filler that electronic documents are examined by a client side program and the fields of forms

contained in the documents are automatically filled out. There are neither explicit nor

implicit motivations to combine the automatic form filler of Rawat'340 and the system for

creating online table of Burch'708. Furthermore, Rawat'340 teaches the form mapping is

coded in XML or other page description (col.9, lines 51-55), which is different from the

codes with respect to the table when editing taught by the present invention.

Claim 7 is dependent on amended Claim 1. When in combination with amended

Claim 1, amended Claim 7 emphasizes the indication taught by the present invention is

dragging and dropping of a cursor device. The feature is not a well-known method when

such dragging and dropping functionalities in combination of editing a table disclosed by the

present invention is regarded as a whole. Thus, it is neither explicit nor implicit to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to acquire, from in combination of Burch'708 and Yee'956, the

entire scope of features of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) be

reconsidered and withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

In the light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that

all pending Claims 1 through 16 as currently presented are in condition for allowance.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed that art cited but relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant

also has thoroughly reviewed that prior art made of record and not relied upon by the

Examiner. Applicant has concluded that these references do not affect the patentability of

these claims as currently presented. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that there is any issue which could be resolved by a

telephone or personal interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the

undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which may be required to

maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such an extension is to be

charged to Deposit Account No. 04-1061.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean C. Edwards

Jean C. Edwards
Registration No. 41,728

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
1901 L St., N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202/659-6946
Facsimile: 202/659-1559
Date: **February 3, 2005**

DC 46602-381 99811